



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STRACK'S "ABODA ZARA"

Aboda Zara. Der Mišnatraktat "Götzendienst." Herausgegeben von Prof. D. Dr. HERMANN L. STRACK. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage mit deutscher Übersetzung. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS, 1909. pp. 731 + 20, 8°.

STRACK has published four treatises of the Mishna to serve as text-books for those who wish to be initiated into the post-biblical Jewish literature. One of them has appeared in a third edition, and two in second editions, the best proof of their usefulness. Strack not only gives help to the student by a very careful punctuation, explanatory notes, and a good glossary, but also tries to present as correct a text as possible, with the material accessible to him, which also includes some MSS. Fully conscious that it is at present impossible to present a critical edition, he tries to establish a text which is much nearer to the original than any other (see especially his introduction to *Schabbath*, Leipzig 1890, p. 7). In this he has certainly succeeded, and his texts mean a considerable step forward. One can only express the wish that his promise to continue these editions may be realized in the near future.

The second edition of his *Aboda Zara* is a marked advance upon the first (Berlin 1888). Not only has the text and especially its vocalization been carefully revised, but the apparatus has also been increased by the addition of the vocalized Codex Kaufmann and the *editio princeps* of the Palestinian Talmud. Among the texts utilized, the Palestinian version prevails, being represented by three important codices. The Babylonian version, on the other hand, is only represented by the Venice edition and occasionally the Munich MS, according to Rabinowicz. Here the material might easily have been increased by the addition of

Alfasi, the oldest complete witness of this version. Of course, only the *editio princeps* (Constantinople 1509) is available for critical purposes, as all the later editions are interpolated (see Rabinowicz, דקדוקי סופרים, IV, 4-5; מאמר על הדפסת התלמוד, 130-1). In addition, the Berlin Library possesses an important old MS. of this work (Cat. Steinschneider, No. 6). Alfasi proves, for instance, that the addition in I, 3 (p. 9*, note *h*) וְגוֹי שֶׁעָשָׂה מִשְׁתָּה לְבָנוּ occurring in M with the variant וְיוֹם for וְגוֹי, is not characteristic of the Babylonian version, since he did not have it. It is interpolated from a Baraita as it is introduced 14a by תָּנִי. Krauss, *MGWJ.*, 1902, 322, thinks that it was taken from Tosefta I, 4; but there the wording is different. In Alfasi also the addition to II, 1 (p. 11, n. c) is missing, exactly as it is in M. It is taken from Tosefta III, 3. As Strack often gives minute variations, one does not see why they are omitted for the first Mishna; in I, 2 P reads ר' שמעון which, though incorrect, ought to have been mentioned, as the confusion between ר' ישמעאל and ר' שמעון occurs very often; I, 3 P M read אלו הן; I, 4 (p. 10*, l. 1) P and Alfasi reads מקום without the article; I, 5 P ונקלבים, Alfasi ונקלבים, Aruk נקלוס; I, 6 Alfasi reads נוקא and בי מסחאות. In I, 8 (p. 11*, note *z*) M reads מה שקיצן, which reading is supported by as early an authority as R. Hai Gaon in whose מקח וממכר X, almost the whole of chapter I is incorporated and for which Cod. Berlin 1605 might have been compared, Alfasi reads משיקין; *ib.* B M read יוסי ר' ר' יוסה, אומר בארץ ישראל משבירין להן בתים אבל לא שדות אף בא"י משבירין, but R. Hai and R. Hanahel agree with Strack's text; Alfasi reads משבירין להן שדות. The addition to I, 8, note, which Tosafot found in some codices but rejected is not found in the majority of codices according to the Tosefot R. Elhanan (Husiatyn 1901, f. 20b) nor in that of R. Tam. After ר' the name אליעזר [B אליאור] is omitted, for בשכר M reads נשברו. These remarks, which are partly taken from Rabinowicz, do not deal with important readings and only refer to the apparatus. As to the text, it is worth mentioning that all corrections introduced by R. Josef Ashkenas of Safed (see *MGWJ.*, 1898, 42 ff.) after collation of numerous MSS., are, as far as I have compared them, found in Strack's text; all he throws out occur only in the apparatus, certainly a splendid testimony for Strack's accuracy and thoroughness. Only one unimportant

ant variant is put in the apparatus, I, 8 (11*, note *a*) where Ashkenas once more agrees with Codex Kaufmann. So the publication of Adeni's *מלאכת שלמה* in the new Wilna edition of the Mishna does not add new material to our text. I have only noted that in I, 7, Maimonides is to be added to the authorities adduced for the reading *בי מוסיאות* (p. 10*, note *w*). Strack observes (p. 4*) that B (the Babylonian Talmud ed. Venice) often agrees with the common text of the Mishna editions, which means that these editions were changed according to the printed text of the Babylonian Talmud. This took place in the earliest known editions, subsequent to that of Naples. So the edition Venice, 1546 (folio) has the addition p. 9*, note *h*, and omits the words p. 10*, note *p* (the following leaf is missing in the copy at my disposal). The same text is offered by the edition of Venice 1549 with Obadia Bertinoro's commentary which contains in the copy belonging to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, all the 6 Sedarim. not merely the last three which Steinschneider (*Cat. Bodl.*) and others believed were the only ones printed; comp. also Strack's Introduction to the Talmud, 4th ed., 77. This edition also contains the additions I, 8 (p. 11*, note *y*) and II, 1 (*ib.*, note *c*), etc. It seems, therefore, that all the known Mishna editions with the exception of that of Naples are interpolated and thus useless for scientific purposes. Strack has rightly neglected them. It is curious that, as far as we know, the manuscripts containing the text of the Mishna without any commentary (Codd. Cambridge, Kaufmann, Parma) represent the Palestinian version, while those with Maimonides' commentary seem to be independent of both the Palestinian and Babylonian version. Whether they agree among themselves has not yet been investigated.

The translation which Strack has added to the new edition will be a great help to the student, but it is often too literal and unidiomatic, and even lacks clearness. I quote two examples: p. 2, l. 5-9 Strack translates: "Der Tag, an dem er...vom Meere heimgekehrt ist...nur dieser Tag und dieser Mann ist verboten" instead of: An dem Tage, an dem jemand von einer Seereise heimgekehrt ist..., und nur an diesem Tage und mit diesem Manne ist es verboten (Geschäfte abzuschliessen). P. 3, l. 11 is unin-

telligible, as it reads at present. To "bestimmt Angegebenes" the addition that it is meant for idolatrous purposes is indispensable. The change from plural to singular p. 1, l. 6, though occurring in the text ought to have been avoided. In the notes appended to the translation, special attention is paid to parallels from classical literature, which are very instructive. Of course, here and there, one must disagree with Strack. Thus, p. 1, note 2, שאל refers to borrowing of things which are returned as received, לזה to money or such things the value of which is to be returned. P. 2, note 15: Practical decisions are not mentioned as a basis for discussions, but as the strongest and unmistakable proof for the opinion of its authors (comp. מעשה רב B. b. 130b). The glossary which also has been carefully revised is very useful. It is peculiar that it contains an article "שָׁל" (eigentl. שָׁלַח) since the editor rightly, though against most of his authorities, in this new edition, has always connected it with the following word; שאל V is rendered in the glossary "jemdn. bitten lassen" while in the translation he has "leihen." Such little inaccuracies will easily be avoided in a later edition. The little book can be warmly recommended and will undoubtedly prove a great help to the student. Strack has once more earned the gratitude of all those who are interested in a scientific study of post-biblical Jewish literature.

Strack has speedily fulfilled his promise to continue his excellent editions of parts of the Mishna, which he gave in his *Aboda Zara*. There have just appeared two more treatises: *Sanhedrin-Makkoth*. Die Mischnatraktate über Strafrecht und Gerichtsverfahren nach Handschriften und alten Drucken. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Prof. D. Dr. HERMANN L. STRACK. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS, 1910. pp. 60 + 56, 8°. The editor follows the same method and principles as in his *Aboda Zara* and the same general remarks apply to this new work. The apparatus has been increased by the readings of the famous De Rossi MS. 138, which shows a close affinity with the Cambridge MS. edited by Lowe and the Kaufmann MS., and hardly offers any new and striking differences as it does in some other treatises. The Palestinian version, therefore, is represented in the apparatus even stronger than in *Aboda Zara*. Strack, in the

introduction, expresses his doubts whether the Cambridge MS. actually represents the Palestinian recension of the Mishna, a doubt that was first uttered in 1887 by J. H. Weiss in *האסיה*, IV, p. 225-30. However, the three manuscripts are undoubtedly very closely connected with the Mishna text of the Palestinian Talmud and they all form one family. A glance at the variants put together in Krauss' description of the Kaufmann manuscript (*MGWJ.*, 1902) proves this point. The Babylonian version is again systematically represented only by the Venice edition of this Talmud, the Munich MS. being quoted only occasionally according to the *Variae Lectiones* of Rabbinowicz. In this respect the new edition of Sanhedrin by Krauss (*The Mishna treatise Sanhedrin*, edited with an introduction, notes and glossary, Leiden, 1909 (pp. XIII + 61, 8°) offers much more, recording all the important variants collected by Rabbinowicz. But Krauss includes in his apparatus readings of texts which are without any critical value like the later editions of the Palestinian Talmud; their disagreement between one another has as little interest for the construction of the text as the readings of the Wilna edition, where, in the margin, Rabbinowicz also has been excerpted. Strack's principle of an eclectic use of the different texts also recommends itself more than the reprint of the *editio princeps* given by Krauss. Altogether, the question which is the *editio princeps* of the Mishna is not quite settled as yet. The Seminary Library has recently acquired 8 leaves (forming the thirteenth quire) of a Mishna edition in square characters without any commentary in octavo, which seems to me to have been printed before the edition of 1492. The leaves contain the end of Baba batra and almost the whole of Sanhedrin and offer a good many very interesting readings, not found in the apparatus of Strack's and Krauss' editions. I will describe this fragment elsewhere. For a second edition, this fragment, as well as the *editio princeps* of the Talmud (Barco 1496 found, if I am not mistaken, in Munich), and of Alfasi ought to be utilized as well as the variants of Rabbinowicz, which for Makkot are also easily accessible in Friedmann's edition. The oldest known variants, those recorded in the Talmud as for VI, 5 the remark of the Palestinian Talmud *אנן תנינן קליני אית תני תני קל אני* also belong into the apparatus.

In the list of authorities p. 6-7 those recorded among the variants ought to be added.

Without going into any further details, I only add a remark about one point, the connection between Sanhedrin and Makkot. On the one hand, this is shown not only by the contents but also by the form (comp. VII, 4 אלו הן הנסקלין IX, 1 ... אלו הן הנשרפין. ואלו הן הנהרגין XI, ואלו הן הנחנקין with Makkot II, 1 אלו הן סנהדרין נוהגת בארץ Mak. I, 10b אלו הן הלוקין; Mak. I, 10b אלו הן הלוקין; Mak. I, 10b אלו הן הלוקין; Mak. I, 10b אלו הן הלוקין according to Hoffmann (*Ha-Misderonah* I (1887), p. 215) was probably originally the end of Sanhedrin). On the other hand, the Babylonian Talmud expressly mentions Makkot as a separate treatise (*Shebu'ot* beginning; comp. Hoffmann, *Nesikin*, p. XIV).

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America

ALEXANDER MARX